

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

The Office Action alleges that the Declaration of the Inventors is defective for allegedly failing to contain a signature of an inventor. Applicants respectfully submit that a duly-signed declaration, signed by all inventors, was filed in the USPTO on February 19, 2002 in response to a Notice to File Missing Parts of Application. Applicants respectfully point out that there were two pages marked as "Page 5 of 6" in the declaration, and that the second "Page 5 of 6" contains the proper signature of the allegedly missing inventor. Applicants respectfully submit that this minor typographical error in page numbering does not render the declaration defective, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to the declaration.

Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 15-19 are pending. Claims 2, 4, and 11-14 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1, 5-7, 9-10, 15, and 18-19, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at pages 31-33 and Figs. 14-15.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A. Claims 7-10

Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,072,983 to Klosterman (hereinafter, merely “Klosterman ‘983”).

Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

“... command means for commanding display of a chat;
and
chat display controlling means for controlling the
display of a chat window so that, when display of the chat is
commanded by said command means, the chat window display
is not overlapped with the display of the electronic program
guide.”

(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Klosterman ‘983 relates to a scheme for displaying television schedule information received from multiple sources. A microprocessor mixes and sorts the schedule information received from multiple source devices. The schedule information is then displayed in a television schedule guide. A user can select a program by pointing to that program in the displayed schedule information. The system then carries out an automatic switching/tuning such that the required source device is input to the destination device, and a tuner is then tuned to the selected program's channel.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Klosterman ‘983 that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 7. Specifically, Klosterman ‘983 does not teach or suggest command means for commanding display of a chat, or chat display controlling means for controlling the display of a chat window so that, when display of the chat is commanded by the command means, the chat window display is not overlapped with the display of the electronic program guide, all as recited in claim 7.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 7 is patentable.

Independent claims 9 and 10 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to independent claim 7, and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

B. Claims 15, 16, and 18-19

Claims 15, 16, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,940,073 to Klosterman (hereinafter, merely “Klosterman ‘073”).

Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*:

“... command means for commanding display of a chat;
and
chat display controlling means for controlling the
display of a chat window so that, when display of the chat is
commanded by said command means, the chat window display
is not overlapped with the display of the web information and
the program information.”

(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Klosterman ‘073 relates to a system and method for displaying an electronic program schedule guide. The system has areas for displaying program schedule information. In addition, the system also has areas that may be used for advertising programs, products or services.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Klosterman ‘073 that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 15. Specifically, Klosterman ‘073 does not teach or suggest command means for commanding display of a chat, or chat
display controlling means for controlling the display of a chat window so that, when display of
the chat is commanded by the command means, the chat window display is not overlapped with
the display of the web information and the program information, all as recited in claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is patentable.

Independent claims 18 and 19 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to independent claim 15, and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication No. 2005/0204387 to Knudson et al. (hereinafter, merely “Knudson”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,299,010 to Nakazawa et al. (hereinafter, merely “Nakazawa”).

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Klosterman ‘073 in view of Klosterman ‘983.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... command means for commanding display of a chat;
and

chat display controlling means for controlling the
display of a chat window so that, when display of the chat is
commanded by said command means, the chat window display
is not overlapped with the display of the electronic program
guide.”

(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Knudson relates to an interactive television program guide system and method. Time separators are displayed within lists of program listings to allow users to more easily view the program listings. On-screen arrows have their display characteristics changed according to user actions. Similar program listings are displayed only once when using search program listings. Users are provided with an opportunity to view channel information before setting channels as favorites. Information from local information

services is provided in program guide display screens that are configurable by a main facility.

Users are provided with an opportunity to centrally lock and unlock programs, and to bypass locks when desired.

As understood by Applicants, Nakazawa relates to a channel display device in which a channel number which is receiving discrimination is flashed while a list of all channel numbers is displayed on a television screen. Also, a display color of the channel number discriminated as being in a receiving state is changed. Thus, a receivable channel from within a number of channels can be readily confirmed.

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Knudson or Nakazawa, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, neither Knudson nor Nakazawa, taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest command means for commanding display of a chat, or chat display controlling means for controlling the display of a chat window so that, when display of the chat is commanded by the command means, the chat window display is not overlapped with the display of the electronic program guide, all as recited in claim 1.

Klosterman '983 and Klosterman '073 fail to provide any relevant disclosure as explained above, and fail to render claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 17 unpatentable.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 5 and 6 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to independent claim 1, and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800